Marxism in Comparative International Education[1]

Robin Shields

Kalyan Kumar Kameshwara

Abstract

This chapter introduces several Marx's concepts such as Historical Materialism, ideology, labor and value, competition and surplus with examples based in the contemporary context. It explores how these ideas have been applied in education research and discusses the relevance of Marxian political economy for the field of CIE.

As funding models for the universities have altered since the 1980's, Marx's conceptualization of dynamics governing Money-Commodity-Money cycles and the tendency of decline of surplus through competition are useful in understanding the financial challenges of universities in contemporary times. This chapter also attempts to situate phenomenon like tuition fee escalations, depression of wages and labor costs in current political economy and also presents a Marxist critique of the neo-liberal paradigm. The chapter concludes with a case study that uses Marxist concepts of political economy to analyze marketization in higher education.

Keywords: 5 to 10 keywords

Marx, political economy, comparative international education, labor markets, higher education

[1] This document is unrevised draft submitted for publication. The final revised and published version: Shields, R., & Kameshwara, K. K. (2021). Marxism in Comparative and International Education. In T. D. Jules, R. Shields, & M. A. M. Thomas (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury Handbook of Theory in Comparative and International Education* (pp. 53-68). London: Bloomsbury. https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/the-bloomsbury-handbook-of-theory-in-comparative-and-international-education-9781350078765/

Introduction

Few social theorists can claim as much influence on the development of social theory and the course of political history as Karl Marx (1818-1883). He was born in 1818 to a middle-class family in what was then the Kingdom of Prussia. As a student at the Universities of Bonn and Berlin, Marx became increasingly politically active and subsequently pursued a career in journalism, writing and editing for newspapers that were highly critical of the government. To escape state censorship and political persecution, he moved from Prussia to Paris, where he met his lifelong friend, collaborator, and co-author Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), before settling in London in 1850 where he remained until his death in 1883.

Marx is best known for his theory of political economy, a theoretical explanation of how economic, social, and political forces interact with one another. His account of political economy was considerably more critical than the neoclassical theories of Adam Smith (1723-1790) and David Ricardo (1772-1823). Marx's work focuses on exploitation and the distribution of surplus in society. By including these aspects of political economy, Marx's theory of political economy provides a better explanation of many contemporary trends he observed: the continued impoverishment of the working class despite increasing productivity and economic growth, the expansion of capitalist trade throughout much of the world, and its connection to the liberal values of the Enlightenment.

Marx's work has been the subject of much debate and critique in both academic and political circles. Subsequent academic theorists criticized his account of cultural and human agency (Giddens, 1979), and the failure of communist states in the 1980s and 90s was seen as evidence that his ideas were fatally flawed (Lipset & Bence, 1994). However, subsequent crises in capitalist societies, for example the financial crisis of 2008, and rising inequality in many countries throughout the world have brought a new relevance to and interest in Marx's work. Thomas Piketty's (2014) acclaimed book, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, in many senses continues Marx's investigation into the consequences and outcomes of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few.

This chapter introduces Marx's social philosophy as it relates to comparative international education (CIE). It begins by introducing key aspects of his theory of political economy, and exploring how these ideas have been and can be applied in educational research. It then identifies

the relevance of Marx's ideas to CIE research, and concludes with a case study that uses Marxist concepts of political economy to analyze marketization in higher education.

Overview

Key Aspects of Marx's Political Economy

Marx's intellectual career spanned over 40 years and produced more than 20 books and publications. While outside of the academy Marx (1848/2015, 1978) is best known for his call in the *Communist Manifesto* to "centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state" (p. 26, 490), the analysis and discussion here focuses more on his later works that describe his social philosophy: *The German Ideology* (1846/2004), *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* (1844/2004), and, most significantly, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (1876/1990). These theoretical works are far more systematic, insightful, and useful in explaining the social relations studied and used in CIE.

Taken together, these works describe a theory of political economy, an explanation of how economic, social, and political forces interact with one another. Marx's (1978) theory of political economy is particularly concerned with the dynamics of capitalism (i.e., societies characterized by free exchange of goods and wage labor). Marx was deeply interested in the work of the earlier neoclassical economists, in particular Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Marx's (1978) theory of capitalist political economy takes their ideas as a starting point, but then provides a more complex account of the flow and accumulation of capital and focuses on the exploitative aspects of wage labor. This theory can be best understood through the explanation of several key ideas and concepts, specifically:

- Historical Materialism: The means of production and relationships of production together determine the cultural and intellectual conditions of society.
- Labor and Value: The primary basis of value is labor-time. In other words, the value of any commodity is determined by the time it took to produce it.
- Competition and the Decline of Surplus: Market competition results in a tendency for profit (surplus) to decline over time, creating a downward pressure on workers' pay and a continual impetus for economic growth.
- Ideology: The values and beliefs that make the extraction of surplus legitimate and thereby enable the exploitation of the laborers.

Historical Materialism

Marx (1859/1970) viewed the material world as driving the conditions of social life, including culture and even ideas and thoughts. In this respect, he departed from the school of Hegelian philosophy, which viewed ideas as shaping the world. Thus, in a Marxist analysis, "life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (Marx & Engels, 1846/2004, p. 47). Therefore, if scholars want to understand how a society works, they must start by focusing on the material subsistence and continuity of the society, how its members feed, clothe, house, and otherwise sustain themselves.

Marx (1876/1990) calls the ways in which a society produces the material requirements of its existence the "mode of production" (Part one, Chapter 1, p. 175). This materialism is 'historical' in that Marx (1876/1990) analyzes changes in the modes of production over time: he points out that ancient societies (i.e., Greece and Rome) used exploitative slave labor in key areas of production such as agriculture and manufacturing. Subsequently, feudal societies in Europe relied on a system of bonded serfdom and land ownership. Serfs were tied to a particular plot of land and were required to work for the nobility who owned it by cultivating crops; they were allowed to retain a share of crops for their own subsistence but paid a heavy share to landowners.

He contrasts these historical modes of production with his contemporary capitalism, in which workers were ostensibly free to sell their labor as they wished. Unlike in the past, workers in Marx's (1876/1990) contemporary society could not be forced to work against their will and could sell their work to whomever agreed to buy it. However, Marx (1876/1990) argues that most workers are in a position that requires them to sell their labor: they do not own the means of production that would enable them to independently secure their livelihood (e.g., land or property), and therefore they are required to sell their labor to someone who would pay them for their work.

Value and Surplus

Marx (1876/1990) was also particularly concerned with the notion of surplus; in any mode of production some workers produce more than they consume themselves, resulting in a surplus. In both the ancient and feudal modes of productions, slaves and serfs were forced to produce a surplus that was retained by the powerful slave owners and nobility, respectively.

In the capitalist mode of production, capital owners accumulate the surplus of workers' labor in their profits. Marx (1876/1990) specifically describes a Money-Commodity-Money

(MCM) cycle. In this cycle, a capital owner will take an initial stock of money (M) and invest in raw materials and workers' labor-time to create a commodity (C). For example, a factory owner would buy materials such as cotton and thread, then hire factory workers to produce commodities such as shirts and trousers. In more contemporary times, a cafe owner might pursue an MCM cycle as follows:

1. The cafe owner starts with $200 in capital (M)
2. The owner invests $70 in coffee beans, $30 in milk, and $100 in barista labor to create 200 cups of coffee, which are the commodity (C). Each cup of coffee therefore cost $1 to produce.
3. The cups are sold for $2 each, creating a total income of $400 and a surplus (i.e., a profit) of $200 (M). At the end of the day, owner would have turned $200 into $400.

Thus, the capital owner seeks to retain a surplus by selling the finished commodity for more money than they originally invested in raw materials and labor-time; in other words, they would seek to make a profit. In contrast, the workers produce the full value of all the coffee sold, adding $300 to the initial $100 in raw materials. However, they are unable to claim the surplus of $200 as their own because they do not own the means of production, and they retain only their salary of $100. In Marx's (1844/2004) language, they become *alienated* from their work, meaning they do have command or own the fruits of their labor, or control the processes that produce it. With each iteration of this MCM process, profit accrues in hands of the cafe owner, and therefore one outcome of capitalist production is growing inequality, or "the accumulation of capital in a few hands" (Marx, 1844/2004, p. 61). In recent decades, discussions about the wealthy 1% serve as a prime example of capital accumulation.

Competition and the Decline of Surplus

The free exchange of labor and payment that characterizes the capitalist mode of production also creates competition, both between workers and between capital owners. Marx (1876/1990; 1894/1981) extends the work of neoclassical theorists on the benefits of competition by arguing that competition also results in a tendency for surplus to decline over time. To return to the example of the cafe owner above, the high profits obtained by the cafe owner ($200) would likely attract other capital owners to start similar cafes. In order to attract customers, these new

cafes would eventually need to sell their coffee at lower prices, perhaps $1.75 or $1.50 per cup, and the original owner may need to drop prices to match them. Thus, for all cafe owners the rate of profit would decline over time.

To the coffee consumer, the 'invisible hand' of competition would seemingly lower the price of coffee close to its actual cost of production, or the total sum of labor and materials ($1 per cup). However, capital owners would see decreasing returns on their investment. According to Marx (1894/1981) they would therefore seek to counteract this decline through a variety of mechanisms:

- 'Increasing intensity': Labor could become more efficient through new technology or management, for example new machinery or a streamlined process. Thus, the same amount of capital could yield 250 or 300 cups of coffee, which would increase profits.
- 'Depression of wages': Workers' pay could be reduced, or new workers could be found who would work for less money. Marx notes that there is usually a surplus of labor relative to the demand of capital owners, meaning that laborers are dependent upon capital owners for employment and their livelihoods. An "unemployed reserve army of workers" is thus an essential characteristic of the capitalist system (Engels, 1844/2008, p. 84).
- 'Foreign trade': The cafe owners could open new locations in areas with less competition, and obtain a higher rate of profit, or they could source materials from areas with lower cost. Over time, this geographic expansion could encompass much of the world. Marxism therefore contains an account of economic globalization that would be developed by later scholars (Griffiths, this volume; Wallerstein, 1974), but one he recognized in claiming "the modern history of capital dates from the creation in the 16th century of a world-embracing commerce and a world embracing market" (Marx, 1876/1990, p. 219).

Thus, this decline in the rate of surplus caused by market competition creates a need for capitalism to continually grow, both geographically and in the efficiency of its production methods. If growth stops (or even becomes negative as in a recession), capital owners will seek to reduce salaries and the condition of workers will quickly deteriorate. Continual economic growth is therefore a necessary condition for capitalist societies, sometimes described as the spinning wheels that keep the bicycle of capitalism upright (Nuwer, 2017). While this growth has many benefits, ecological Marxists also point out that it is unsustainable and involves a continual

acceleration in the depletion of environmental resources (Foster, 1997; O'Connor, 1998), prompting Jameson (2003) to point out that it is now "it is easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism" (p. 76).

Ideology

In Marx's time, the proletariat (i.e., the working class) comprised most of the population, in contrast to a relatively small number of 'bourgeoisie,' the capital owners who are not required to work but rather own the means of production (land, factories, etc.). This imbalance raised a difficult question of how capital owners continued to retain profit when they were both outnumbered and dependent upon the producers.

For Marx (1846/2004), the answer to this question lay in the idea of ideology, a set of beliefs and values that enabled the extraction of surplus to seem legitimate. Just as the bourgeoisie factory owners controlled the physical means of production, they also controlled the production of ideas and ideals. Marx and Engels (1846/2004) refer to those producers or thinkers as "active, conceptive ideologists who make the perfecting of the illusion of the class about itself their chief source of livelihood" (p. 65). In the case of capitalism, these ideals are those of Enlightenment liberalism: individualism, freedom and the 'natural' law of property (Hochstrasser, 2000; Waldron, 1987). These contrast to those of feudal times, which asserted the 'divine right' of monarchs and enshrined the hierarchy of feudal society in religion. Thus, the true sign of bourgeoisie power is not only to exploit the working class, but to establish and maintain a set of beliefs in which the working accepts this arrangement as fair, natural, and legitimate.

Marx (1846/2004) also noted how each new mode of production developed an increasingly abstract ideology. In feudal societies, most production required to sustain the population took place within the confines of a lord's estate, and the ideology of feudal society therefore emphasized the legitimacy of the feudal hierarchy and its basis in religious doctrine. In contrast, capitalist nation-states that emerged in the 16th and 17th century included more elaborate forms of production, which involved complex chains of raw material production and industrial manufacturing that spread over a wider geographic territory. As part of their day-to-day lives, people produced and consumed commodities that involved labor and materials from distant areas with which they had no personal connection. This larger geographic basis necessitated a new and more abstract notion of national identity, in which workers who would never meet face-to-face would share a sense of belong to

the same 'imagined community' (Anderson, 1983). As the means of production came to encompass not only nation-states but their colonial conquests, this ideology again adapted to focus on membership in a common empire based on universal notions of progress. Marx and Engels (1846/2004) thus describe the process through which universal values emerge:

> If now in considering the course of history we...will necessarily come up against the phenomenon that increasingly abstract ideas hold sway, i.e. ideas which increasingly take on the form of universality. For each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled, merely in order to carry through its aims, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, that is, expressed in ideal form: it has to give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones (p. 66)

Thus, Marx's (1876/1990; 1894/1981; 1978) political economy provides an account of how a few key drivers—namely the extraction of surplus value by capital holders, the declining rate of surplus, and the consequent impetus for growth and expansion—explain many aspects of social and political life. These insights can be applied well beyond Marx's context of 19th century Europe, including contemporary societies and specialized fields such as comparative international education.

Application in CIE

Education is important in several aspects of Marx's work. In *Communist Manifesto*, he makes one of the earliest arguments for universal education, explicitly demanding "Free and equal education for all children in public schools" (Marx & Engels, 1848/2015, p. 28). This ideal would go on to be adopted in many national policies, in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in the Education for All movement (United Nations, 1948, UNESCO, World Conference on Education for All, 1990).

Marx and Engels (1848/2015) do not discuss education at lengths in any of their works, but he nevertheless considers it important in empowering the proletariat to resist exploitation by the bourgeoisie: "The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements

of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie" (p. 12).

However, Marx and Engels (1848/2015) also acknowledges that education is determined by social conditions, serving, and reproducing the ruling class. Marx and Engels (1848/2015) therefore call on the proletariat to "rescue education from the influence of the ruling class" (p. 13). Thus, Marx and Engels (1848/2015) ascribe dual roles to education: it is both a process that sustains and reproduces the capitalist system of exploitation, but also as a means to create a more egalitarian society.

Subsequent theorists and researchers have applied Marx's concepts and ideas to many aspects of educational research. Three overarching themes in this literature are the relationship between education and ideology, education and critical pedagogy, and the role of education in capitalist labor markets. In this section, we discuss how each of these themes has been investigated in educational research generally and make specific links to comparative international education research.

Education, Social Reproduction, and Ideology

One of the first and most well-known applications of Marxism in the educational literature is Bowles and Gini's' 1976 book *Schooling in Capitalist America*, in which the authors argue that schooling mirrors the structure of capitalist societies. In their analysis, the main purpose of schooling is not learning or cognitive development but rather the 'hidden curriculum,' which prepares children for life in a capitalist society. Aspects of schooling such as the hierarchical relationships between teachers and students, the emphasis on strict timetables and limited freedom over one's time, and individualized notions of achievement and reward all prepare students for work environments that share these characteristics, such as factories. To support this social reproduction, schools maintain ideology of meritocracy; claiming that inequalities in society are legitimate because they are based on intellectual achievement rather than by birth. However, Bowles and Gini's (1976) argue that the achievement in education is mainly a form of social reproduction, showing that parents' income and education are better predictors of students' educational achievement than factors such as their intellectual abilities (measured through IQ).

Just one year later, Willis (1977/2017) made similar arguments in his ethnographic study "Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs." Willis (1977/2017)

conducted fieldwork at a boys' secondary school in England, through which he developed an analysis of how students associated with two cultures within the school. While the dominant culture accepted the hierarchical and disciplinarian nature of the schooling system and the need to invest in educational achievement, the other rejected the legitimacy of academic achievement and instead focused on the authenticity of manual work. Willis (1977/2017) theorized that by rejecting academic achievement, this 'counterculture' socialized young men into working class occupations, and schooling therefore reproduced class structures by disenfranchising the working class from education.

In the same decade, Bourdieu and Passer (1977) eloquently theorize education as a means of reproducing class inequalities. Their work argues that an education system involving tools such as examinations, pedagogy, curricula, and extracurricular activities favors students from the dominant or privileged classes (Dalal, 2016), and it thus excludes, alienates, and disenfranchises students from dominated classes. Bourdieu (1990) argues that an individual's class position shapes his or her habitus (disposition)—which is constituted by their habits, mannerisms, behavior, personality, accent, body language, style, etc. The education system is portrayed as a rational and neutral institution and the factors and prejudices that go into defining merit are, what Bourdieu (1990) refers to as, 'misrecognized.'[2] Thus, the education system acts a system of cultural reproduction through which marginalized students accept the legitimacy of their class position.

In the field of comparative international education, the direct application of Marxist theory peaked shortly after these key education texts, particularly in the 1980s. For example, Ginsburg and Arias-Godínez (1984) studied social reproduction in non-formal education in Mexico, asking whether non-formal radio education actually transformed social inequalities or simply served to reproduce them. Bullivant (1983) makes a similar argument in Fiji, where he argues that the emergence of schooling as an institution has contributed to a form of hegemony of the educated. The field of CIE also offered a unique opportunity to study education systems that were nominally based on Marxist political theory, i.e. China, Cuba, and the USSR, often pointing to the ways in which class segmentation persisted through ethnicity and language in countries that espoused a classless ideology (Bilinsky, 1964; Hawkins, 1978).

More recently, Marxist concepts remain pertinent in analysis of social class and the division of labor; for example, Phillips (2013) argues that education in rural education Tanzania

[2] Something similar to what Marx refers as *appearance* or *false consciousness* (Gaventa, 2003).

facilitates a division of labor between the less educated manual laborers and the more educated elites. In addition, Marxist analyses, his critique of political economy is influential as an underpinning to other theories of political economy, for example Wallerstein's World Systems Analysis (Griffiths, this volume), neo-Marxism (Novelli, this volume) or cultural political economy.

Critical Pedagogy

The connection between Marxism and critical pedagogy traces its roots to Paolo Freire's (1970) notion of *conscientização* (or conscientization), the dialogic process by which peasant workers became aware of the exploitative nature of their labor. Freire (1970) draws upon Marx's analysis of surplus extraction and the dependency of laborers on capital owners, identifying the ways in which education supported this oppression, and imagining how education could instead be used to transform society and liberate the oppressed.

Freire (1970) argues that most modern education is 'banking education,' it focuses on the depositing of facts on information (as one transfers money into a bank) that accept the logic of the *status quo*. For Freire (1970), a truly liberating and humanizing education enables the learner to critically understand their world, to identify relationships of exploitation and oppression, and to transform them. He quotes Marx's (1845) assertion that "the educator himself needs educating" (point 3) to call for an end the practice of banking education and the development of critical pedagogies that enable critical consciousness.

Since Freire's (1970) work, the concept of critical pedagogy has been applied and developed by many other scholars and represents an important field of educational research.[3] For example, Peter McLaren (2005) and Henry Giroux (2011) have both developed arguments for critical pedagogy strongly rooted in Marxist and Freirian perspectives, examining the exploitative processes of global capitalism and neoliberal policies and describing how they prevent social justice. In contrast, bell hooks (1994) takes an intersectional approach to critical pedagogy that combines Marxist elements of class struggle with analysis of race and gender, arguing that critical pedagogy requires approaches that transcend these boundaries as well as those between the student and teacher, resulting in a pedagogy that centers on dialog.

[3] See Thomas & Schweisfurth, this volume.

In the field of CIE, Freirian critical pedagogy has been and remains an important perspective in much research. For example, Bartlett (2005) studies the application of Freirian principles in non-formal literacy education in Brazil. Reflecting a critical and nuanced approach to the topic, Bartlett (2005) identified many principles of Freirian philosophy but also argues "Freire's dichotomous notion of knowledge suffers from an early Marxist theory of power as binary and repressive" (p. 360), in other words, it could do more to focus on the multiple and competing forms of power that coexist in any social situation, rather than a simple distinction between the oppressed and the oppressors. More recently, Khoja-Mooli (2017) has applied a Freirian approach to teachers' professional development, showing how the notion of 'conscientization' can also be applied to the oppressive relationships and ideologies of former colonial relationships. Her approach also combines theoretical perspectives, while it draws upon Freire's Marxist origins it is equally concerned with theories of post-colonialism.[4]

The Political Economy of Education and Labor Markets.

In capital, Marx (1990) analyzes education as part of the overall production process, arguing, in order to modify the human organism, so that it may acquire skill and handiness in a given branch of industry, and become labor-power of a special kind, a special education or training is requisite...The expenses of this education (excessively small in the case of ordinary labor-power), enter *pro tanto* into the total value spent in its production (Marx, 1876/1990, p. 229).

In the mid 20th century, neoclassical economists Jacob Mincer (1958) and Gary Becker (1964) would describe this role of education in their theory of human capital, which sought to apply the concepts of returns on capital investment to education. In subsequent years, studies of "human capital" sought to establish the rates of economic return to education in contexts around the world (Kapur et al., 1997, p. 796).

While recognizing the economic value of education and skills, a Marxist perspective also analyzes how competition in the labor market can result in a decreasing return to skills over time. That is, as more workers in the labor force gain skills, the salary 'premium' these skills command decreases. These skills also increasingly dawn the nature of being more and more specialized. Alongside an 'absolute' return to specialized education, education also becomes about 'positional competition,' meaning that workers acquire skills to differentiate themselves and from other

[4] See Hickling-Hudson, this volume.

competitors in the labor market (Hirsch, 1976). In the worst case, some have argued education becomes a form of credentialism, meaning that it is a barrier to entry into high paid work, but one that adds little value to productivity (Collins, 1979; Dore, 1976).

Some studies from CIE highlight the declining skills premium due to the emergence of high-skills, low wage labor markets. For example, in their book *The Global Auction*: *The Broken Promises of Education, Jobs, and Incomes*, Brown et al. (2010) argue that competition from new high-skill, low-wage economies (e.g., India and China) will result in a decline in the salary premium of high-skilled jobs in the Global North. The result is that "middle-class families...are having to run faster, for longer, just to stand still" (Brown, 2003, p. 6); in other words, the declining surplus associated with education means that families must devote increasing time, resources, and social pressure to education so that their children maintain high-paying employment.

Conclusions

This chapter has introduced Karl Marx's theory of political economy, focusing on the concepts of historical materialism, labor, and value, and surplus and the decline of surplus, and ideology. It has shown how this analysis has been applied to education research generally, and comparative education in particular. Although Marx's work has its share of critics, it has inspired subsequent theorists and informed research across many social science disciplines. As global capitalist societies continue to engender conflict and crisis, Marxism remains a relevant and insightful theoretical perspective in comparative international education.

Further Reading

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life.* New York: Basic Books.

Giroux, H. (2011). *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Continuum Books.

Hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1978). *The Marx-Engels Reader* (2nd ed.), edited by Robert Tucker. New York: Norton.

McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy against Empire*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.

Willis, P. (1977/2017). *Learning to labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. London: Routledge.

Mini Case Study

Higher Education Marketization

Many national policies in the 1980s saw new methods of funding higher education that more closely resembled markets: core state funding for universities was reduced in many countries and replaced with higher tuition fees and per-student funding models (Portnoi et al., 2010; Shields, 2013a). Universities were therefore required to compete to attract students, creating a form of higher education market. While this higher education market was quite different from the capitalist labor markets analyzed by Marx (1978; 1876/1990), many of his insights on the behavior of markets nevertheless apply. Indeed, a key feature of marketized higher education is the commodification of education, with university degrees produced through an MCM cycle just like any other commodity (Machingambi, 2014; Naidoo, 2003; Naidoo & Jamieson, 2005; Shumar, 2013). The commodification of higher education is supported in policies such as the World Trade Organization's General Agreement in Trade on Services, which regulates international trade in higher education in a manner similar to other service industries (Robertson et al., 2002).

Furthermore, the growth of competition has led to the decline in surplus described Marx: while established universities previously enjoyed predictable state funding, the growth in for-profit institutions and competition from other institutions has led to financial pressure and a continued pressure for growth. Universities have undertaken significant and noticeable changes to offset the decline in revenues, which closely resemble those described by Marx (1876/1990; 1894/1981): increasing intensity and efficiency, depression of wages and labor costs, and international trade.

Increasing intensity is evident in many aspects of higher education. For example, universities make increasing use of technology to improve the efficiency of their teaching and operations. Not only does e-learning allow universities to reach more students, but Universities now employ technology to manage all aspects of their work, from student records, to finances, to storing and organizing research outputs (Noble, 1998; Siemens & Long, 2011). Additionally, a large body of literature now describes the application of new public management techniques to higher education, which aim to make universities more efficient by increasing accountability and linking pay to performance (Bleiklie, 1998; Deem & Brehony, 2005).

Hand-in-hand with this drive for efficiency is a downward pressure on pay and squeezing of the labor force. These forces are most evident casualization of the academic profession, with many permanent and tenured positions replaced by adjunct faculty who are paid on an hourly or per-course basis. Even permanent positions face a squeeze, as salaries often do not keep up with inflation and retirement benefits are cut (Ginsberg, 2011).

Universities' international activities are perhaps the most noticeable change associated with marketized higher education: the past twenty years has witnessed dramatic changes in universities' international activities. To make up for declining public funding, universities have enrolled increasing numbers of international students, who often pay higher tuition fees than domestic students (Shields, 2013b; Shin et al, 1999); this trend is evident in the growing number of students who go abroad for higher education, which increased from 1.4 million in 1999 to 4.8 million in 2016 (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2018). It is not only students who go abroad; universities themselves have expanded internationally by establishing overseas branch campuses, which deliver degree programs from the home campus to students residing in another country. International branch campuses have expanded in number from 15 in 1995 to 250 in 2017 (Cross-Border Educational Research Team, 2017). Universities seek to generate a financial surplus in these campuses, which can be used to subsidize the home country institution.

Thus, a Marxist analysis captures and explains many prominent trends in contemporary higher education, focusing on how the market forces entail a set of dynamics that create a drive for efficiency, a downward pressure on salaries, and an impetus for growth. Like capitalism more generally, growth is an essential feature of market-based higher education: few universities are content to maintain the status quo, but instead seek new ways to grow in terms of revenues and students, if for no other reason than to mitigate against future risk and possible further funding cuts (Varghese, 2009). Even elite universities with highly selective admissions (e.g., the Ivy Leagues and 'Oxbridge') find ways to grow through short-term certificate programs and endowment investments.

These trends are generally most evident in countries with very marketized higher education systems, such as the United Kingdom, United States, Australia, and New Zealand. Many Universities in these countries operate international branch campuses to increase revenues, for example both the University of Nottingham in the United Kingdom and Monash University in Australia operate international campuses in Malaysia and China, while Georgetown University,

based in Washington, D.C. operates a branch campus in Doha, Qatar. In the United States, downward pressure on salaries is most evident in the casualization of academic work: well-paid and secure tenured positions are replaced with lowly paid, flexible adjunct roles at many institutions (Rees, 2015), while in the United Kingdom pay has not kept up with inflation since the 2008 credit crisis (The Guardian, 2017).

To be sure, a Marxist analysis does not capture the entirety of trends in higher education. For example, trends such as global labor market mobility and intercultural exchange have also driven the internationalization of higher education. Furthermore, Marginson (2013) points out the ways in which higher education is not a 'true' market but rather a kind of 'pseudo-market' or 'quasi-market.' Nevertheless, Marx's (1990) theory of capital provides the tools for a coherent analysis of this important development in educational policy and practice.

References

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2010). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Paris: UNESCO.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Bartlett, L. (2005). Dialogue, knowledge, and teacher-student relations: Freirean pedagogy in theory and practice. *Comparative Education Review*, 49(3), 344-64.

Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bilinsky, Y. (1964). Education of the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union. *Comparative Education Review*, 8(1), pp. 78-89.

Bleiklie, I. (1998). "Justifying the evaluative state: New public management ideals in higher education." *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 4(2), 87-100.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: SAGE Publications.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life.* New York: Basic Books.

Brown, P. (2003). The Opportunity Trap: education and employment in a global economy. *European Educational Research Journal*, 2(1), 141-179.

Brown, P., Lauder, H., & Ashton, D. (2010). *The Global Auction: The Broken Promises of Education, Jobs, and Incomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bullivant, B.M. (1983). Cultural Reproduction in Fiji: Who Controls Knowledge/Power? *Comparative Education Review, 27*(2), 227-245.

Collins, R. (1979). *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.

Cross-Border Education Research Team (2017). C-BERT Branch Campus Listing. [Data originally collected by Kevin Kinser and Jason E. Lane]. Available: http://cbert.org/branchcampuses.php. Albany, NY (Accessed on 17th July 2018)

Dalal, J. (2016). Pierre Bourdieu: The Sociologist of Education. *Contemporary Education Dialogue, 13*(2), 231-250.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). "Management as ideology: The case of 'new managerialism' in higher education." *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217-235.

Dore, R. (1976). The Diploma Disease. Education, Qualification and Development. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Edwards, R., & Edwards, J. (2001). Internationalization of education: A business perspective. *Australian journal of education, 45*(1), 76-89.

Engels, F. (2008). *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.* New York: Cosimo. (Original work published 1844)

Foster, J.B. (1997). "The Age of Planetary Crisis: The Unsustainable Development of Capitalism." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 29(4), 113–42.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum

Furedi, F. (2016). *What's happened to the university?: A sociological exploration of its infantilisation*. New York: Routledge.

Gaventa, J. (2003). Power after Lukes: an overview of theories of power since Lukes and their application to development. *Brighton: Participation Group, Institute of Development Studies*.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The Fall of the Faculty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ginsberg, M.B., & Arias-Godínez, B. (1984). Nonformal education and social reproduction/transformation: Educational radio in Mexico. *Comparative Education Review,* 28 (1), 116-127.

Giroux, H. (2011). *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Continuum Books.

Hawkins, J.N. (1978). National-minority education in the People's Republic of China. *Comparative Education Review*, 22(1), pp. 147 - 162

Heinrich, M., & Locascio, A. (2012). *An introduction to the three volumes of Karl Marx's Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Hirsch, F. (1976). *Social limits to growth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hochstrasser, T. J. (2000). *Natural law theories in the early enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Jameson, F. (2003). Future City. *New Left Review,* 21 (May-June), pp. 65-79.

Kapur, D., Lewis, J. P., & Webb R. C. (1997). *The World Bank: Its First Half-Century*. Volume 1. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Khoja-Mooli, S. (2017). Pedagogical (Re)Encounters: Enacting a Decolonial Praxis in Teacher Professional Development in Pakistan. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S146-S170.

Lipset, S. M., & Bence, G. (1994). Anticipations of the Failure of Communism. *Theory and Society*, 23(2), 169-210.

Lukács, G., & Lukács, G. (1971). *History and class consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics* (Vol. 215). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Machingambi, S. (2014). The impact of globalisation on higher education: A Marxist Critique. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, *5*(2), 207-215.

Marginson, S. (2013). The impossibility of capitalist markets in higher education. *Journal of Education Policy, 28*(3), 353-370.

Marx, K. (1970). *A contribution to the critique of political economy*. Moscow: Progress Publishers. (Original work published 1859)

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1978). *The Marx-Engels Reader* (2nd ed.), edited by Robert Tucker. New York: Norton.

Marx, K. (2004). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.* Translated by M. Milligan. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1844)

Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. London: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1876)

Marx, K. (1981). *Capital, volume III*. New York: Vintage. (Original work published 1894)

Marx, K. (1845). Theses on Feuerbach. Accessed on 11 August 2018 at https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/index.htm

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2015). *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1848)

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2004). *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers. (Original work published 1846)

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2001). *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. London: Electric Book Co.

McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy against Empire*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield.

Mincer, J. (1958). 'Investment in human capital and personal income distribution.' *Journal of Political Economy*, 66, 281–382.

Naidoo, R. (2003). Repositioning higher education as a global commodity: Opportunities and challenges for future sociology of education work. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *24*(2), 249-259.

Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Knowledge in the marketplace: The global commodification of teaching and learning in higher education. In P. Ninnes and M. Hellstén (eds), *Internationalizing Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 37-51.

Noble, D. F. (1998). Digital diploma mills: The automation of higher education. *Science as Culture*, *7*(3), 355-368.

Nuwer, R. (2017). How Western civilization could collapse. BBC News, accessed at http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20170418-how-western-civilisation-could-collapse on 2 August 2018

O'Connor, J. R. (Ed.). (1998). *Natural causes: Essays in ecological Marxism*. New York: Guilford Press.

Patnaik, P. (2007). Alternative perspectives on higher education in the context of globalization. *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, *21*(4), 305-314.

Phillips, K.D. (2013). Dividing the labor of development: Education and participation in rural Tanzania. *Comparative Education Review,* 57(4), 637-661.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Portnoi, L. M., Bagley, S.S., & Rust, V.D. (2010). "Mapping the terrain: The global competition phenomenon in higher education." In V.D. Rust, L.M. Portnoi, & S.S. Bagley (eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and the Global Competition Phenomenon*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1 – 13.

Rees, J. (2015, March 20). Tenure is on life support. Accessed at https://chroniclevitae.com/news/947-tenure-is-on-life-support on 25 September 2018.

Robertson, S. L., Bonal, X., & Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the education service industry: the politics of scale and global reterritorialization. *Comparative Education Review*, 46(4), 472–96.

Shields, R. (2013a). *Globalization and International Education.* London: Bloomsbury.

Shields, R. (2013b). Globalization and international student mobility: A network analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 57(4), 609-636

Shin, C., Welch, A., & Bagnall, N. (1999). "Culture of competition? Comparing international student policy in the United States and Australia." *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 23(1), 81–99.

Shumar, W. (2013). *College for Sale: A Critique of the Commodification of Higher Education.* London and Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Siemens, G., & Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. *EDUCAUSE review*, *46*(5), 30.

The Guardian. (2017, Sept. 22). Vice-chancellors may be winning big from tuition fees – but academics aren't. Accessed at https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2017/sep/22/vice-chancellors-pay-scandal-tuition-fees-academics-universitiy-salary on 25 September, 2018.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. 2018. Data Center: Student mobility country of origin, 1999 – 2016. Accessed at http://data.uis.unesco.org/ on 28/02/2018.

United Nations. (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: Author.

Varghese, N. V. (2009). Globalization, economic crisis and national strategies for higher education development. *International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) Research Paper, UNESCO. Paris: IIEP*.

Waldron, J. (1987). Theoretical foundations of liberalism. *The Philosophical Quarterly* 37(147), 127-150.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Willis, P. (1977/2017). *Learning to labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. London: Routledge.

World Conference on Education for All. (1990). *World Declaration on Education for All and Framework to Meet Basic Learning Needs*. Paris: Author.